

Appln No. 09/693,484  
Amdt. Dated March 23, 2004  
Reply to Office action of December 31, 2003

4

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is amended to require "at least one receiving zone (12) for receiving an integrated circuit or chip", and "the integrated circuit electrically associating with a plurality of electrical contacts (42) within the at least one receiving zone". Further amendment of claim 1 also requires "forming an electrical terminal (18) on island-defining portions (16), each electrical terminal (18) being electrically connected to one or more of the plurality of electrical contacts (42) within the at least one receiving zone (12)". Claim 2 is amended to remove features introduced into amended claim 1.

These amendments are fully supported by the specification as filed, for example, see Fig. 2 and the description at page 4, line 24 to page 5, line 36.

Under item 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 8 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Grabbe (US 5,173,055).

Grabbe teaches the manufacture and use of connector 50 comprised of separate contacts 10 including contact fingers 18 (see Fig. 5). There are no serpentine members between contacts 10.

The Examiner considers a contact 10 to be "a receiving zone for receiving an integrated circuit" as required by claim 1. Respectfully, this is not a physical possibility. Claim 1 has been further amended to require "the integrated circuit electrically associating with a plurality of electrical contacts within the at least one receiving zone". Clearly, Grabbe does not disclose or teach electrical contacts on the contact 10, or contact fingers 18, so that an integrated circuit, i.e. chip, can be received by the contact 10 and electrically function. Contact 10 can in no way be construed to be adapted to receive an integrated circuit and provide a functional integrated circuit carrier.

The Examiner refers to the metal sheet 12 illustrated in Fig. 1 to disclose each feature of claim 1. The sheet 12 is simply a patterned flat metal sheet with various areas removed. There are no insulating regions or electrical pathways. Sheet 12 should not be construed as "an integrated circuit carrier" as if an integrated circuit were to be placed on a contact 10 of Grabbe, the integrated circuit would short-circuit rendering it useless. This is no different to placing an integrated circuit or chip on a metal surface and expecting it to function normally. Contact 10 is not a "receiving zone for receiving an integrated circuit or chip" as in claim 1 of the present application.

Moreover, referring again to Fig. 1 of Grabbe, dotted circles 16 are intended to be removed as shown in Fig. 5. Subsequently, as shown in Fig. 10, unattached remaining members 52 are removed to leave connector 50 shown in Fig. 11. By inspection of Fig. 1 it is clearly seen that if circles 16 are removed there is no possibility that serpentine members can be construed to exist between contacts 10 as resulting members 52 are unattached. Hence, material of the sheet 12 between contacts 10 should not be construed as serpentine members as such material is designed to be completely removed and in no way functions in "reducing thermal strains involving the said island-defining portions (16)" as required by present claim 1.

In summary, Grabbe provides flexible contact between two printed circuit boards that may physically flex over time, for example due to weight on the plastic board, this is a generally

Appln No. 09/693,484  
Amdt. Dated March 23, 2004  
Reply to Office action of December 31, 2003

5

"macro-scale" problem. In contrast, the present invention solves the problem created by an integrated circuit or chip heating-up and thereby introducing thermal strains in the contact points between the integrated circuit or chip carrier and the printed circuit board holding the carrier, this is generally more of a "micro-scale" problem.

None of the other prior art of record can be combined with Grabbe to arrive at the present invention. Grabbe cannot be altered by simple incorporation of features of cited prior art to arrive at any of the present claims.

It is respectfully submitted that in light of the foregoing comments and amendments concerning Grabbe claim 1 is patentable. Hence, the dependant claims are likewise patentable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 USC §102 and 103. The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762